### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-19 and 21-23 are pending in the application. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 9 and 19 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended to recite receiving a message indicating that a time zone change has occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zone. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's § 112 rejection has been overcome. Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 13-18 and 21-23 depend from claims 1, 9 and 19, and similarly overcome the § 112 rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 112 rejection.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-10, 13-14, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,845,257 to Fu et al. ("Fu").

Applicants have amended claims 9 and 19 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claims 9 and 19 have been amended to recite receiving a message from a source external to said handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zone.

As mentioned in the background, the daily organizer function of most handheld computing devices have become one of the most popular applications. However, as communications and travel have made dealing with associates around the world more feasible,

there is a need for a daily organizer which accounts for time changes for conference calls and meetings. Among the problems the present invention is intended to solve is the problem of synchronizing start and end times of calls and meetings so that start and end times can be displayed as local time or the time at some arbitrary time zone. As such, the present invention proposes, *inter alia*, receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred. This message may be received from, for instance, a wireless network provider or a network (see Specification page 11, lines 5-9).

By contrast, Fu is directed to scheduling and tracking events across multiple time zones where a personal information manager automatically set its local time to a new time zone via conventional broadcasted reference signals. Fu does not teach or suggest a message being received which is confirmed by a user input confirming the time zone change.

Since Fu does not disclose each and every limitation recited in claims 9 and 19, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 and 19 are allowable over the cited reference. Claims 10, 13-14, 16, 18, 21 and 23, by their dependency on claims 9 and 19, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

# Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020116541A to Parker et al. ("Parker").

Applicants have amended claim 1 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred and an input from a user confirming said change in time zone.

As mentioned in the background, the daily organizer function of most handheld computing devices have become one of the most popular applications. However, as communications and travel have made dealing with associates around the world more feasible, there is a need for a daily organizer which accounts for time changes for conference calls and meetings. Among the problems the present invention is intended to solve is the problem of

synchronizing start and end times of calls and meetings so that start and end times can be displayed as local time or the time at some arbitrary time zone. As such, the present invention proposes, *inter alia*, receiving a message from a source external to the handheld computer indicating that a time zone change has occurred. This message may be received from, for instance, a wireless network provider or a network (see Specification page 11, lines 5-9).

The Examiner's base reference, Fu, is directed to scheduling and tracking events across multiple time zones where a personal information manager automatically set its local time to a new time zone via conventional broadcasted reference signals. Fu does not teach or suggest a message being received which is confirmed by a user input confirming the time zone change.

The shortcomings of Fu are not overcome by Parker nor is Parker cited for such teachings. Parker is directed to optimizing user notifications for small computing devices. However, Parker does not teach or suggest a message being received which is confirmed by a user input confirming a time zone change. Therefore, neither Fu nor Parker teach or suggest a message being received which is confirmed by a user input confirming a time zone change.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that any combination of Fu and Parker does not teach or suggest every claimed feature of the invention. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-3, 5, 7 and 8, by their dependency on claim 1, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

#### Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner enter the Amendment after Final and reconsider all presently outstanding rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

By:\_

Dated: April 28, 2006

Bosco Kim

Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C. 9255 Sunset Boulevard Suite 810 Los Angeles, CA 90069 (310) 247-2860